



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/649,260

08/25/2003

Anand G. Dabak

TI-35237

7206

23494

7590

05/19/2010

TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED

P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999

DALLAS, TX 75265

EXAMINER

PHAN, MAN U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2475

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/19/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@ti.com

Advisory Action

1. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. It's the examiner's position that the reference is applied herein for the teaching of a novel method and system for receiving transmission in a wireless communication system. As presented in the last office action, the Applicant's attention is directed to Fig. 1 of Nakamura et al. (US#6,920,173) for the structure of an interference cancellation unit 200 includes a despreader 201 for multiplying a receive signal S by a despreading code that is identical with the spreading code, thereby outputting a despread signal; a demodulator 202 for demodulating "1", "0" of user data and control data on the basis of the result of despreading; an attenuator 203 for attenuating the demodulated signal by multiplying the result of demodulation by a damping coefficient that conforms to the degree of reliability; a re-spreader 204 for spreading the demodulated signal again to thereby output an interference replica; and a symbol-replica interface 205 for creating and sending a symbol replica (Col. 12, lines 40 plus). In the same field of endeavor, Kim (US#6,810,007) discloses in Fig. 1B a block diagram of an orthogonal frequency division multiplexing (OFDM) receiving system for receiving a signal transferred from the transmission system of Fig. 1A. The receiving system of Fig. 1B includes an LPF 110, an analog-to-digital converter (ADC) 111, a cyclic prefix remover 112, an FFT 113, a Q-ary demodulator 114, a parallel-to-serial converter (PSC) 115, and a block decoder 116. The LPF 110 in the receiving system filters the transmitted OFDM signal at the same frequency band as the LPF 106 of the transmission system. The ADC 111 converts a filtered signal into a digital signal, and the cyclic prefix

Art Unit: 2475

remover 112 removes the cyclic prefix added in the transmission system. The FFT 113, the Q-ary demodulator 114, the PSC 115 and the block decoder 116 perform inverse processes of the processes performed by the counterparts of the transmission system, thereby restoring an OFDM signal (See Fig. 2A; Col. 3, lines 39 plus).

In response to applicant's argument that the combination of cited references fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). It is not necessary that a "prima facie" case of unpatentability exist as to the claim in order for "a substantial new question of patentability" to be present as to the claim. Thus, "a substantial new question of patentability" as to a patent claim could be present even if the examiner would not necessarily reject the claim as either fully anticipated by, or obvious in view of, the prior art patents or printed publications. As to the importance of the difference between "a substantial new question of patentability" and a "prima facie" case of unpatentability see generally *In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852, 857 n.5, 225 USPQ 1, 4 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Also, See MPEP § 2141.01(a) for a discussion of analogous and nonanalogous art in the context of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. See MPEP § 2131.05 for a discussion of analogous and nonanalogous art in the context of 35 U.S.C. 102. 904.02.

4. In response to Applicant's argument that the reference does not teach or reasonably suggest the functionality upon which the Examiner relies for the rejection. The Examiner first

Art Unit: 2475

emphasizes for the record that the claims employ a broader in scope than the Applicant's disclosure in all aspects. In addition, the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim limitations, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. Since the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. In other words, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk I, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in

Art Unit: 2475

scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims.

The Examiner has interpreted the claims in parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to distinctly define the claimed invention.

5. In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, i.e., Nakamura et al. (US#6,920,1730 and Kim (us#6,810,007) as proposed in the office action. The Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). It must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Since no substantial amendments have been made and the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the claims are drawn to the same invention and the text of the prior art rejection can be found in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the references cited and applied in the last office actions for the rejection of the claims are maintained in this office action. The final rejection mailed on November 26, 2008 is therefore maintained.

Application/Control Number: 10/649,260

Page 6

Art Unit: 2475

Mphan.

02/23/2010

/Man Phan/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2475